

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 8, 2007. Claims 1-33 are pending in the application and were rejected. With this response, the drawings, the specification, and claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 have been amended. The remaining claims are unchanged and no new claims are added. Applicants submit that with the amendments to the drawings and the specification, no new matter is added. These amendments are made to expedite the prosecution of this case, while preserving the right to subsequently pursue the originally filed claims, and in no way limit the scope of the invention.

The drawings and specification were objected to because of the double inclusion of reference number 730 to designate both features of “identification module” and “agent selector” in Figure 7. These features were also indicated to be element 730 in the specification at paragraph [0025]. With this amendment, both the specification and the drawings have been amended. Specifically, paragraph [0025] and Figure 7 have been amended to refer to the “agent selector as element 735. Applicants respectfully request that this objection now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McFarlane in view of Bremers. The Office Action states that McFarlane teaches a skill impacting system because the “skills of the agents change based on tools available and fulfillment of requirements to the next level. This is a system that impacts the skills of the agents.”

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 so that “the skill impacting system includes a learning management educational system, a customer satisfaction scoring system, and a performance metrics scoring system, and wherein the skill data includes satisfaction assessments, completion or results from a training course, and performance metrics.” Support for this amendment is included in the specification at least in paragraph [0021] and in Figure 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not shown or made obvious in the prior art. McFarlane does not teach the particular tools used to provide changes to the agents skill that might correspond with the features of “a learning management educational system, a customer satisfaction scoring system, and a performance metrics scoring system” as set forth in

the amended claims. Further, McFarlane does not teach particular skill data used to determined skill impact that might correspond with “wherein the skill data includes satisfaction assessments, completion or results from a training course, and performance metrics” as also set forth in the amended independent claims.

Applicants also respectfully submit that these amended features are not made obvious in the prior art base don’t he combination of McFarlane and Bremers. The prior art does not shown or make obvious a system with three specific systems including a skill database, a skill impacting system with the claimed features, and routing logic. With the amendment, the skill impacting system is a particular feature with the set forth limitations. This is not obvious in view of the prior art system set forth in the Office Action of something that changes the agents’ skills. The amended limitations set forth specific features that impact the skills and to determine the skill impact as set forth in the amended claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of the independent claims based on the combination of McFarlane and Bremers.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims described above. By virtue of their dependency, the pending dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-18, 21-22, 24-29, and 31-33 are patentable also. Applicants respectfully request removal of the prior art rejection of those claims also.

Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection, and request favorable action and allowance of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection and favorable action and allowance of the application.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at 612-607-7237. If any fees are due in connection

with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees including fees for any extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference No. 60021-378501).

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740
Customer No. 29838
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP
45 South Seventh Street, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609
Telephone: (612) 607-7237